DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 275 957 CG 019 489

AUTHOR Prager, Karen J.
TITLE Intimacy Status and Couple Communication.
SPONS AGENCY Texas Univ., Dallas.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Students; *Dating (Social); Higher Education; *Interpersonal Communication; *Self Disclosure (Individuals); *Spouses
IDENTIFIERS *Intimacy

ABSTRACT

Based on Erikson's theory that successful resolution of the intimacy versus isolation crisis results in the enhancement of one's capacity to maintain close relationships, it was hypothesized that a fully developed capacity for intimacy would affect the depth of a person's self-disclosure to his or her romantic partner. A sample of 53 couples ranging in age from 19 to 57 completed an intimacy status interview, the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ), and a relationship satisfaction measure, and were videotaped while discussing topics of varying levels of privacy from the JDSQ. Those with full versus partial resolutions to the intimacy crisis were best differentiated by their JSDQ scores, their satisfaction scores, and the percentage of their dialogues that was high in both private description and affect. The best predictor of an individual's behavioral self-disclosure was his or her partner's self-disclosure level. Similarly, the best predictor of one partner's positiveness was the other's level of positiveness. When disclosure levels were high, the relationship between the partners' disclosure levels disappeared unless both had fully developed capacities for intimacy. Results were interpreted as supporting Erikson's theory. Forty-two references are included. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED275957

Intimacy status and couple communication[1]

Karen J. Prager[2]

The University of Texas at Dallas

[1]This research was supported by an Organized Research Grant from The University of Texas at Dallas.

[2]Requests for reprints should be sent to Karen J. Prager, School of General Studies, The University of Texas at Dallas, Box 830688, Richardson, Texas 75083-0688.

CG 019489

The author gratefully acknowledges the assistance of Antonio Gonzalez and Richard Yeager in the conduct of this study.

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April, 1986.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen J. Prager

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

Based on Erikson's theory that successful resolution of tne intimacy vs. isolation crisis results in the enhancement of one's capacity to maintain close relationships, it was hypothesized that a fully developed capacity for intimacy would effect the depth of a person's self-disclosure to his or her romantic partner. A sample of 53 couples ranging in age from 19 to 57 completed an intimacy status interview, the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, a relationship satisfaction measure, and were videotaped while discussing topics of varying levels of privacy from the JSDQ. Those with full versus partial resolutions to the intimacy crisis were best differentiated by their JSDQ scores, their satisfaction scores, and the percentage of their dialogues that was high in both private description and affect. The best predictor of an individual's behavioral self-disclosure was his or her partner's self-disclosure levels. Similarly, the best predictor of one partner's positiveness was the other's level of positiveness. When disclosure levels were high, the relationship between the partners' disclosure levels disappeared unless both had fully developed capacities for intimacy. Results were interpreted as supporting Erikson's theory.

Intimacy status and couple communication

Although considerable evidence exists indicating that one's developed capacity for intimacy, or intimacy status, is correlated with other aspects of psychosocial development (Fitch & Adams, 1983; Kacerguis & Adams, 1980; Orlofsky, 1978; Orlofsky, Marcia & Lesser, 1973; Tesch, 1984; Tesch & Whitbourne, 1982), a relationship between intimacy status and individuals' actual behavior in their closest relationships has yet to be demonstrated. Self-disclosure, the verbal communication about private, personal aspects of the self, is a critical behavior in the establishment and maintainance of close relationships (Altman, & Taylor, 1973; Chelune, 1979; Cozby, 1973; Derlega & Chaikin, 1975; Frankfurt, 1973; Morton & Douglas, 1981; Waring & Chelune, 1983). However, the relationship between successful intimacy development and self-disclosure has only begun to be understood, and is the subject of this paper.

According to Erikson (1963; 1968), successful coping with the intimacy vs isolation "crisis" of young adulthood results in a capacity to commit oneself to an enduring relationship that is deep and close, i.e. characterized by emotional sharing, mutual caring, and an investment in its future. Unsuccessful coping may result in isolation, in which a person shuns all but the

most superfical contact with others. More commonly, less than optimal resolution results in a type of folie a deux, or pseudointimacy, a relationship in which interaction is constricted, rigid and ineffective, allowing both partners to avoid intimacy.

Based on Erikson's theory, Orlofsky, Marcia and Lesser (1973) suggested that persons could be categorized according to their style of coping with the "intimacy crisis", and that this style of coping would reflect their individual capacity for intimacy. Calling these styles of coping "intimacy statuses," Orlofsky, et al. developed a classification scheme in which the cooperativeness, closeness, mutual caring, individual autonomy, and mature sexuality characterizing a person's closest relationships were used as criteria for placing an individual into an intimacy status group. The intimacy statuses are: Intimate--the person has committed to an enduring relationship that has high levels of the above-listed criteria; Pseudointimate--the person has committed to an enduring relationship, which is significantly lacking in more than one of the above-listed criteria; Preintimate--the individual has one or more relationships that fit the criteria but has not committed to one; Merger--the person has committed to an enduring relationship that meets the criteria for closeness and mutual love, but is not characterized by equal autonomy for each partner; Stereotyped Relationships--the person has a number of

casual relationships that are relatively superficial and do not meet the criteria; and Isolate--the person is socially withdrawn with no close relationships. A number of studies have supported the validity of the intimacy status construct (Orlofsky, 1976; Orlofsky & Ginsburg, 1980; Orlofsky, Marcia & Lesser, 1973; Prager, 1983; Tesch & Whitbourne, 1982).

In a study examining the relationship between intimacy status and self-disclosure (Prager, in press), participants provided personal information about themselves via a sentence-completion measure, addressed to a hypothetical target person specified by the experimenter. Results showed Intimate status participants disclosing more to a hypothetical significant other than to a casual acquaintance, while participants in the other statuses disclosed the same amount regardless of the context. Group differences in self-disclosure, therefore, may depend upon the perceived contextual appropriateness. Other studies have shown observers' judgements of psychological maladjustment to be associated with inappropriately high or low levels of self-disclosure, (Derlega & Chaikin, 1976; Solano, Batten & Parish, 1982; Winum, Banikotes & Neimeyer, 1981), while appropriately disclosing persons have been judged as more attractive (Chelune, 1977; Neimeyer & Banikotes, 1981). These lend credence to the notion that depth of self-disclosure may only be affected by intimacy development in traditionally appropriate situations, which therefore served

as the context for the present investigation.

It was important in the current work to determine whether the relationship between intimacy status and self-disclosure would also be found using actual observations of individuals with their real-life partners. Self-report inventories of disclosure, like those used in the above-described study, have not always been adequate predictors of people's actual interactions (see review by Cozby, 1973). Further, most of what is known about actual self-disclosing behavior is based on observations of communication between strangers (e.g. Brundage, Derlega & Cash, 1977; Shapiro & Swensen, 1977; Solano, Batten & Parish, 1982), a situation that does not appear to be affected by a person's developed capacity for intimacy.

In an attempt to extend knowledge about self-disclosure between strangers to that which occurs within established couples, Morton (1978) compared self-disclosure levels of spouse pairs with pairs of strangers using videotaped dialogue. For this purpose, Morton created a two-dimensional scoring system for self-disclosure. One dimension was description, or privacy of facts disclosed about oneself. The other was evaluation, or the depth of emotion, judgement or opinion one expressed. The results showed that the descriptive intimacy level of people's self-disclosure was higher when they were conversing with spouses than when they conversed with strangers.

Morton's study was able to differentiate spouse and stranger pairs, and other research has identified behavioral communication patterns that distinguish between couples seeking counseling and nondistressed couples (Birchler, Weiss, & Vincent, 1975; Gottman, Markman & Notarius, 1977; Margolin & Wampold, 1981). The current work attempted to make a more subtle distinction--between individuals in nonclinical, established couples, differentiated on the basis of their intimacy maturity. The present study used Morton's two-dimensional self-disclosure scoring system to discover whether or not Intimate status individuals could be distinguished from those in the other statuses by the level of privacy with which they communicated to their spouses (or romantic partners) in an experimental situation.

The current work was also the first to assess the intimacy status of both individuals in a romantic partnership. An initial exploration of differences was made between couples in which both partners were in the Intimate status (I-I), those in which only one was in the Intimate status (I-N), and those in which neither was in this status (N-N). A secondary aim was to determine the extent to which one partner's self-disclosure served as a predictor of the other's. Partner self-disclosure has been shown to be the best predictor of behavioral self-disclosure in conversations between strangers (cf. Archer, 1979; Cozby, 1973). However, this effect has not been

replicated with married couples (Morton, 1978). Lastly, the levels of positiveness and negativeness in each individual's dialogue with their partners were assessed. The extent to which intimacy status and partner behavior affected positiveness was investigated.

Method

Participants

Fifty-three couples participated in the study, ranging in age from 19 to 57, with a mean of 31.50 years. At least one person from each couple was an undergraduate student at a southwestern commuter university, who participated in the study for course credit. Married couples constituted 77.4% of the sample, and had been married an average of 9.36 years. The remaining unmarried couples had been together an average of 1.83 years. No couple was accepted for participation unless they had been together a minimum of six months. Fifty-nine per cent were childless in this largely upper-middle class sample--45% were in professional or semi-professional occupations with a mean family income over $30,000/yr.

Procedure

Subjects who signed up for the "couple communication study" were given appointments by telephone to come to campus with their partners for the experiment. An experimenter ushered each couple into a small room with two chairs, a table, and a

microphone suspended from the ceiling. On one wall was a one-way mirror behind which was a video camera and recorder. The couples then received the following instructions:

> "Welcome to [our university] and thank you for your willingness to participate in our study of couple communication. The purpose of our study is to determine how each of you feels about certain topics relevant to marriage and relationships, and see how you talk to each other about these topics. All conversations will be held in strictest confidence and will not be associated with your names. You may however, choose not to respond to any part of the study that you wish. We will give you a series of topics and ask you to spend a certain amount of time discussing each topic. At the end of each time period, I will say "Please stop", and instruct you regarding the next topic. First, read through this list of discussion topics. Please rate each topic according to how much and how completely you have talked with the other person about that topic. For this task, I'd appreciate your not talking to one another. (pause) Next, I'd like one of you to select a topic you would like to talk to the other person about and to start a conversation about it when I leave the room."

Following a five-minute dialogue, the experimenter re-entered the room, asked them to stop, and instructed the other partner to select a topic for a second conversation. At the end of five minutes, the experimenter again entered. This time, the couple was asked to select a mutually agreeable topic and discuss it for the last five minutes. This procedure resulted in three dialogues of five-minutes apiece, each on a different topic. This part of the procedure took approximately 30 minutes. At the end of the videotaping, each individual was taken to a private room and administered the 30-minute intimacy

status interview. At this time, they also completed a demographic questionnaire and a 4-item relationship satisfaction scale. Following the interview, the couple was reunited and thanked for their assistance.

Assessment Procedures

Self-disclosure. Because of the low correlations generally found between self-report and behavioral measures of self-disclosure, it was assumed for the purposes of this study that both types of assessment were needed to provide a reliable sampling of this behavior. The self-report inventory used was a version of the 20-item Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (JSDQ) (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958). Subjects were asked to indicate which items out of the 20 listed they had discussed with their partner on a 1-3 scale, with '1' = "Have told the other person nothing of this aspect of me," '2' = Have talked only in general terms about this, not in full detail. The other person has only a general idea about this aspect of me," and '3' = "Have talked in full and complete detail about this item to the other person." Each item had also been scaled previously for privacy level on a Thurstone scale by Sherman & Goodson (1975), e.g. "My favorite foods; my least liked foods"--1.85, "My vocational or career plans--3.00, and "Personal problems with my family"--5.03. The JSDQ score was computed by multiplying the rating made by the subject and the previously identified privacy rating for each item, and then summing the

products to produce the final score.

Behavioral self-disclosure was assessed directly from the videotaped interactions. The topics selected by the couples came from the JSDQ and therefore had been previously rated for privacy level. The two-dimensional scoring system developed by Morton (1978) was used to rate the taped dialogues, with some minor modifications by the current author. Each statement in the dialogue was placed into one of four categories. Category 1 included statements that contained both highly private facts and highly personal feelings and judgements, such as "I'm afraid to die because it's unknown." Category 2 statements contained highly private facts but a low level of feeling or judgement, such as in the statement "Sexual matters were not discussed in my family when I was growing up." Category 3 included statements high in personal feelings and judgements but with a low level of factual privacy, such as "Two hours! I'd hate to discuss everything on this list!" Category 4 statements contained communication low on both private facts and personal judgements, as in "It seemed like the sky was a little hazy today."

Behavioral self-disclosure was scored by four graduate and upper level undergraduate students in psychology. The raters, blind to the purpose of the experiment and to all other ratings, assigned each statement in a participant's dialogue to one of the four self-disclosure categories. Dialogue was first scored

for each segment; then, total privacy level scores were computed by averaging the percentage of statements from each of the four categories across the three segments of dialogue, resulting in four scores per participant. The dialogues of 58 of the 106 subjects were rated by a second rater to determine interrater reliability. (When there were disagreements, a third rater was added; the ratings used were those of the one most closely matched to one of the other ratings.) The interrater reliability for each category, using Spearman's rho on the first two ratings, were .71 for Category 1, .64 for Category 2, .72 for Category 3, and .67 for Category 4.

Positiveness vs. Negativeness of Interaction. The three segments of the couples' taped dialogue were also rated for positiveness and negativeness. For each 30 seconds of conversation, the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of each partner were rated according to whether their impact was positive, negative or neutral. Raters were five undergraduate psychology students who were blind to the purpose of the experiment and to all other ratings. Raters were instructed to attend first to the verbal content and second to the nonverbal cues of the participants in deciding whether behavior was primarily positive, negative or neutral. Any positive or negative verbal or nonverbal cues overrode a neutral rating. Examples of positively-rated verbal behavior were expressions of agreement, satisfaction, praise, and humor. Examples of negative verbal

statements were expressions of dislike, put downs, making excuses and discounting of partner. Facial expression and voice tone were the most critical nonverbal behaviors that affected ratings. Positively-rated nonverbals included smiles, nods, and empathic facial expression, as well as soft, warm or cheerful voice. Negative nonverbals included facial expressions of fear, disgust or shame, and clipped, cold, or sarcastic voice tone. Total scores, computed for each partner, were the percentage of positive, negative, and neutral intervals across the three segments of dialogue.

All ratings were made by teams of two raters, and all couples were rated by at least two teams. Occasionally, a third rating was used when the first two ratings were highly discrepant (6 - 8 couples). Agreement was computed on an interval-by-interval basis, resulting in a kappa value of .82.

Intimacy status. This was determined by Tesch & Whitbourne's (1982) updated version of the original developed by Orlofsky, Marcia & Lesser (1973). A 30-minute, tape-recorded, semi-structured intimacy interview focused on the participants' relationships with their romantic partners. Interviewers inquired about the following: (1) the practical aspects of the relationship, i.e. whether they did favors for one another or went out of their way for each other; (2) the emotional aspects, i.e. how thoroughly they reported knowing the other person, what they talked about, and how they handled disagreements; (3) their

level of commitment to the relationship, i.e. whether they saw each other exclusively or had plans for the future; (4) the extent of their codetermination in the relationship, i.e. whether each partner was allowed full expression of his/her individuality; and (5) the level of physical closeness, i.e. the quality of affection and sexual expression between the two.

Individuals were assigned to an intimacy status (Intimate, Merger, Pseudointimate, and Preintimate) based on the process by which they related to their romantic partners. Through a series of open-ended questions, interviewers could differentiate, for example, between Intimate and Merger status individuals on the basis of their decision-making process, i.e. how much each person's opinion counted in the final decision. Intimate and Pseudointimate persons could be differentiated based on their descriptions of their partners, i.e. did they seem to know their partners as real people or only as extensions of their own needs? Each intimacy status interview was rated by at least two independent raters (three, when there were disagreements). Interrater agreement between the first two ratings was 72%; two out of three agreed 87% of the time, resulting in a kappa value of .80. Raters were trained upper-level undergraduate and graduate students of both sexes.

Satisfaction. Four items were included on the demographic questionnaire to measure relationship satisfaction: 1) "How likely is it that you would choose your partner if you had it to

do over again?", with response choices from '1' "Not at all likely" to '5' "Extremely likely"; 2) "How frequently do you regret being involved with this partner?," with choices from '1' "Never" to '5' "Very often"; 3) "How many things do you enjoy about your relationship?," with choices from '1' "None" to '5' "Very many", and 4) "How many things are annoying to you about the relationship?" with the same choices as item 3. An effort was made to avoid response sets by framing both positive and negative items and by reverse-scoring two of them. The four items had intercorrelations ranging from rho= 0.37 to rho = 0.53, all significant beyond p = .001. They were therefore summed to provide a single satisfaction measure.

Results

Descriptive statistics

Intercorrelations among the dependent variables are shown in Table 1. The low correlations between the self-report (JSDQ) and behavioral (Categories 1-4) self-disclosure measures are reminiscent of findings from previous research. There was positive covariation between Category 1, self-disclosure that was high in both Descriptive and Evaluative intimacy, and Category 2, self-disclosure that was high in Descriptive intimacy only, and a negative covariation of each of these with Category 3, self-disclosure that was high in Evaluative intimacy only, and Category 4, that which was low on both the Descriptive and Evaluative dimensions. These intercorrelations underscore Morton's (1978) conclusion that the descriptive dimension of self-disclosure intimacy is more salient than the evaluative dimension. The only difference between Morton's results and those of the present work was the lack of correlation between Categories 3 and 4.

Insert Table 1 about here

Preliminary analyses indicated that males and females were distributed equally across the four intimacy status groups. Married couples were also distributed proportionally across the Intimate, Merger, and Pseudointimate groups. The Preintimate

group, uncommitted by definition, were all unmarried.

As has been found in previous studies of intimacy status in adults, the Intimate status participants (N=55) outnumbered the others (Merger, N=18; Pseudointimate, N=20; Preintimate, N=9); the other statuses were thereby combined into a single Nonintimate group (N=47)[1].

Differences among intimacy statuses

A 2(intimacy status) x 2(sex) multiple analysis of variance was conducted to test for differences between the Intimate and Nonintimate groups on the JSDQ, the four categories of self-disclosure, positiveness, satisfaction, and the privacy level of the topics chosen for discussion. Multivariate analyses showed a significant effect for intimacy status (Wilks lambda = .6990, $F(7,87) = 5.34$, $p < .001$), but no effects for sex or the intimacy status x sex interaction. Univariate analyses for intimacy status indicated significant effects for the JSDQ, $F(1,87) = 21.62$, $p < .001$, and for the satisfaction measure, $F(1,87) = 18.71$, $p < .001$, with a marginal effect for Category 1 disclosure $F(1,87) = 3.13$, $p = .08$. Univariate tests showed a significant sex difference on the JSDQ, $F(1,87) = 3.81$, $p < .05$, with no other sex differences nor any effects for the sex x intimacy status interaction reaching significance.

These analyses were followed by stepwise discriminant function analysis, in order to determine which subset of these variables would most effectively differentiate between the

Intimate and Nonintimate status participants. Variables were entered one at a time until the criterion of minimum F-to-enter = 1.00 was no longer met by any of the remaining variables. The resulting function contained three variables (Wilkes lambda = 0.7243; χ^2=31.64, dF=3, p < .0001). The discriminating variables, with their corresponding reductions in Wilks lambda were: JSDQ scores, Wilkes lambda = .8194 (reduction = .18); relationship satisfaction, Wilks lambda = .7510 (reduction = .07); and Category 1 disclosure, Wilkes lambda = .7243 (reduction = .03). The function accurately classified 73.16% of the cases. An examination of the Intimate and Nonintimate group means (shown in Table 2) indicates that Intimate individuals disclosed more than the Nonintimate individuals, both in the self-report (JSDQ) and behavioral (Category 1) samples, and reported higher levels of satisfaction with their relationships.

Insert Table 2 about here

Comparisons Among Couples: Prediction of behavior in dialogue

The following analyses examined the couple as the unit of analysis, and permitted comparisons among three different types of couples, classified according to the intimacy status ratings of the two partners. The three types of couples were 1) those in which both partners had been classified as Intimate (I-I), 2) those in which only one partner had been classified as Intimate

(I-N), and 3) those in which neither partner had been classified as Intimate (N-N).

Two sets of multiple regression equations were constructed to predict couple interaction behavior. One set explored prediction of behavioral self-disclosure, the other positiveness. Arbitrarily, scores for female partners were chosen as dependent variables for the first set of equations, while the male partners' scores were used for the latter. Of greatest interest was the extent to which one partner's self-disclosure and positiveness scores could be predicted from a linear combination of 1) the other partner's behavior in the interaction, 2) both partners' history of self-disclosure in the relationship, and 3) the satisfaction levels of both partners. The results of these analyses may be seen in Table 3.

Prediction of behavioral self-disclosure. Stepwise multiple regression analyses were conducted for each of the four self-disclosure category scores for the female partner. The couples were divided into three groups based on their combined intimacy status ratings (I-I, N-N, I-N). A separate set of four stepwise multiple regression analyses was constructed for both the I-I and the N-N groups (the I-N group was not included due to the small N of 9 couples). Across both groups of couples, the best predictors of the female partner's self-disclosure were the male partner's disclosure levels. There were some group differences, however. Prediction of the female partner's

Category 1 disclosure, the most intimate of the four categories, was significant only in the I-I couples. The male partner's Category 4 disclosure, as well as his JSDQ score, were significant predictors ($R = .800$, $F(2,18) = 8.619$, $p < .01$). The equation for Category 1 was not significant for the N-N couples; for this group, the only significant equation was for Category 3 ($R = .567$, $F(1,14) = 6.634$, $p < .05$).

Prediction of positiveness. For these analyses, the male partner's positiveness score served as the dependent variable, while the independent variables were the female partner's self-disclosure and positiveness scores, and both partners' JSDQ and satisfaction scores. Two stepwise regression analyses were then conducted, one for each group, the I-I and N-N couples, respectively. There were again some differences in the pattern of prediction between the two groups. For the I-I group, the male partner's positiveness score was best predicted by a combination of the female partner's positiveness score and satisfaction levels ($R = .788$, $F(2,19) = 15.518$, $p < .001$), while for the N-N group, the male's total positiveness was best predicted by the female's positiveness score only ($R = .672$, $F(1,14) = 11.53$, $p < .01$).

Insert Table 3 about here

Discussion

Differences among intimacy statuses

Significant differences between the Intimate and Nonintimate groups were found for the JSDQ, and for the relationship satisfaction scores. A marginally significant difference between the two groups was found for the most intimate category of behavioral self-disclosure, i.e. the percentage that contained both private facts and highly personal judgements and affect (Category 1). Sex differences were found only for the JSDQ, with the higher self-disclosure scores of the females replicating this author's earlier work (Prager, in press) as well as that of many others (cf. Archer, 1979).

Follow-up analyses indicated that Category 1 disclosure, along with the JSDQ scores and relationship satisfaction, significantly contributed to a function that accurately classified over 70% of the cases in this study. It was only Category 1 of the behavioral self-disclosure ratings, however, that discriminated between the two intimacy status groups. This may be due to the shared variance of the Categories, resulting in no additional unique discriminating power for any other Category. It may also be due to the lesser levels of intimacy of the other categories, suggesting that placement in the Intimate status is less relevant for self-disclosing at lower levels, being most important at that level which combines disclosure of private facts and a high level of personal feeling

and judgement.

Successful intimacy development, then, may facilitate the use of highly private, affectively-laden self-disclosure, the appropriate use of which has been shown to maintain the closeness, affectionate ties, and satisfaction within one's closest relationship (Levinger & Senn, 1967; Murphy & Mendelsson, 1973; Navran, 1967; Rubin, Hill, Peplau, & Dunkel-Schetter, 1980). Consistent with Eriksonian theory, Intimate individuals also had created more satisfying relationships with their partners than those in the Nonintimate statuses. Other research has also discovered linkages between intimacy, relationship satisfaction and self-disclosure (Hecht, Sereno & Spitzberg, 1984; Levinger & Senn, 1967; Tolstedt & Stokes, 1983; 1984; Waring & Chelune, 1983). A number of these investigators, like the present author, have identified aspects of intimacy that are separate and distinct from self-disclosure, such as "perception of closeness and emotional bonding" (Tolstedt & Stokes, 1984; p. 87), or, "affection, cohesion, sexuality and identity" (Waring & Chelune, 1983), and have consistently found associations between these aspects of intimacy, satisfaction and depth of self-disclosure.

Prediction of behavior in dialogue

The current study also explored the factors which predicted individual behavioral self-disclosure and positiveness in the couple interactions. Individuals' total levels of

self-disclosure, averaged over the three dialogue segments, were found to be highly significant predictors of their partners' self-disclosing behavior, especially when both partners were in the Intimate status. The equivalency of the two partners' self-disclosure privacy in their dialogues is particularly interesting in view of Morton's (1978) seemingly contradictory finding that there was significantly less reciprocity of self-disclosure intimacy in the interactions of married couples relative to stranger pairs. The present findings did not examine statement-by-statement reciprocity, as Morton did, however, but rather identified a global reciprocity in the dialogue of these couples. A similar global equivalence of self-disclosure intimacy in married couples was found by Levinger & Senn (1967) using self-report data. On the surface, the current findings, as well as Levinger and Senn's, appear to contradict Morton's results, as well as Altman & Taylor's (1973) prediction that reciprocity would decrease with acquaintance due to a relaxation of pro forma social norms. It is possible, however, that the statement-by-statement reciprocity traditionally found in the dialogues of strangers is replaced by a global equivalency of self-disclosure intimacy between two well-acquainted partners. After several years of marriage or other intimate relating, this global parity of self-disclosure may represent an unconscious accomodation of each partner to the other.

With Category 1 disclosure, Nonintimate couples showed a lack of parity compared to Intimate-Intimate couples. This lack of exchange at the highest levels of self-disclosure may be one aspect of an incomplete resolution of the intimacy crisis, i.e. the Nonintimate partners may be unable to reciprocate highly intimate material because of their incomplete intimacy capacity.

Examination of Table 3 reveals that the Intimate-Intimate couples also demonstrated equivalency of self-disclosure across more types of dialogue and at higher levels of significance than the Nonintimate couples. There may be a greater sensitivity on the part of the Intimate individuals to their partner's communication. Intimate status individuals may also use their partner's disclosure levels as a gauge in determining their own self-disclosure levels.

The pattern of prediction for positiveness also varied moderately between the two groups of couples. The best predictor of the male partner's behavior in both groups was the comparable behavior by the female partner. However, in the I-I group, the female partner's satisfaction varied significantly with the male's positiveness while this relationship did not reach significance for the N-N group. Since there were no absolute differences in positiveness between individuals classified into the different intimacy statuses, perhaps partner satisfaction is less related to partner behavior for Nonintimate couples, due to the lesser intimacy between the two partners.

Footnote

[1]Because this study solicited only established couples, no one in the Stereotyped Relationships or Isolate statuses participated.

Table 1

Intercorrelation of Dependent Variables

	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Topic Level	Satis-faction	Positive-ness
JSDQ	.05	-.13	.13	-.14	-.10	.31**	-.15
Category 1		.41***	-.34***	-.58***	.38**	-.19*	-.08
Category 2			-.57***	-.57***	.34***	-.09	-.07
Category 3				.02	-.18*	.05	.09
Category 4					-.38***	.03	-.10
Topic Level						-.21*	-.20*
Satisfaction							-.03

*p < .05

**p < .001

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Intimacy Status and Sex on Dependent Variables

	JSDQ	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	Category 4	Topic Level	Satis-faction	Positive-ness
Intimate								
Male M =	172.56	14.19	24.29	17.19	42.11	3.33	15.24	73.83
SD =	14.16	17.28	18.40	16.76	18.62	.63	1.45	29.03
Female M =	176.20	13.52	20.27	19.52	44.01	3.23	15.27	64.10
SD =	13.22	13.28	13.74	16.46	19.13	.66	1.80	33.75
Total M =	174.55	15.79	22.10	20.33	43.73	3.27	15.25	68.63
SD =	13.65	15.31	15.55	14.73	19.17	.65	1.64	31.75
Nonintimate								
Male M =	150.78	7.84	24.04	19.52	48.41	3.40	12.96	67.49
SD =	24.61	10.18	13.94	16.46	16.79	.79	2.85	31.04
Female M =	163.42	10.51	23.21	19.49	46.53	3.46	13.37	56.68
SD =	23.74	9.43	11.78	10.69	14.54	.74	3.37	35.06
Total M =	156.50	11.12	22.94	21.10	46.37	3.43	13.14	62.60
SD =	24.76	10.25	12.67	14.00	14.09	.76	3.06	31.04

Table 3

Summary of Regression Analyses on
Behavioral Self-Disclosure and Positiveness

Couple Type	Criterion Variable	Predictor Variables	R	P
I-I Couples N=42	Category 1	Partner Category 4 Partner JSDQ	.796	.01
	Category 2	--	--	--
	Category 3	--	--	--
	Category 4	Partner Category 4	.717	.001
	Positiveness	Partner Positiveness Partner Satisfaction	.788	.0001
N-N Couples N=32	Category 1	--	--	--
	Category 2	--	--	--
	Category 3	Partner Category 4	.567	.05
	Category 4	--	--	--
	Positiveness	Partner Positiveness	.672	.01
Total Sample N=93	Category 1	Partner Category 4	.475	.001
	Category 2	Partner Category 2	.319	.05
	Category 3	--	--	--
	Category 4	Partner Category 4 Partner Category 3	.584	.0001
	Positiveness	Partner Positiveness	.621	.0001

References

Archer, R. L. (1979). Role of personality and the social situation. In G. J. Chelune, et al., Eds. Self-Disclosure: Origins, Patterns and Implications of Openness in Interpersonal Relationships. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Altman, I. & Taylor, D. A. (1973). Social Penetration: The Development of Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Birchler, G. R., Weiss, R. L., & Vincent, J. P. (1975). Multi-method analysis of social reinforcement exchange between maritally distressed and nondistressed spouse and stranger dyads. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 349-360.

Brooks, L. (1974). Interactive effects of sex and status on self-disclosure. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21, 469-474.

Brundage, L. E., Derlega, V. J., & Cash, T. F. (1977). The effects of physical attractiveness and need for approval on self-disclosure. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 3, 63-66.

Chaikin, A. L., Derlega, V. M., Bayma, B. & Shaw, J. (1975). Neuroticism and disclosure reciprocity. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 43, 1, 13-19.

Chelune, G. J. (1977). Disclosure flexibility and social-situational perceptions. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45, (6), 1139-1143.

Chelune, G. J. (1978). Measuring openness in interpersonal communication. In G. J. Chelune, et al., Eds. Self-Disclosure: Origins, Patterns and Implications of Openness in Interpersonal Relationships. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 2, 73-91.

Derlega, V. J. & Chaikin, A. L. (1975). Sharing Intimacy: What We Reveal to Others and Why. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Derlega, V. J. & Chaikin, A. L. (1976). Norms affecting self-disclosure in men and women. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 44, (3), 376-380.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). Childhood and Society. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.

Fitch, S. A. & Adams, G. R. (1983). Ego identity and intimacy status: Replication and extension. Developmental Psychology, 19, (6), 839-845.

Frankfurt, L. P. (1973). The role of some individual and interpersonal factors in the acquaintance process. In Altman, I. L. & Taylor, D. A. Social Penetration: The Development of

Interpersonal Relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Gottman, J., Markman, H., & Notarius, C. (1977). The topography of marital conflict: A sequential analysis of verbal and nonverbal behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 39, 461-477.

Hecht, M., Sereno, K, & Spitzberg, B. (1984). Communication satisfaction and satisfaction with self and other: The relevance of relationship level and topic level. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10, (3), 376-384.

Kacerguis, M. A. & Adams, G. R. (1980). Erikson stage resolution: The relationship between identity and intimacy. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 9, (2), 117-126.

Jourard, S. M. & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, 91-98. Levinger, G. & Senn, D. J. (1967). Disclosure of feelings in marriage. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 13, 236-249.

Margolin, G. & Wampold, B. E. (1981). Sequential analysis of conflict and accord in distressed and nondistressed marital partners. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 554-567.

Morton, T. L. (1978). Intimacy and reciprocity of exchange: A comparison of spouses and strangers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, (1), 72-81.

Morton, T. L. & Douglas, M. (1981). Growth in relationships. In S. Duck & Gilmour, S., Eds. Personal Relationships: Developing

Personal Relationships. New York: Academic Press.

Murphy, D. & Mendelson, L. A. (1973). Communication and adjustment in marriage: investigating the relationship. Family Process, 12, 317-326.

Navran, L. (1967). Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 6, 173-184.

Neimeyer, G. J. & Banikiotes, P. G. (1981). Self-disclosure flexibility, empathy, and perceptions of adjustment and attraction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, (3) 272-275.

Orlofsky, J. L. (1978). The relationship between intimacy status and antecedent personality components. Adolescence, 8, (51), 418-440.

Orlofsky, J. L. (1976). Intimacy status: Relationship to interpersonal perception. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 5, 73-88.

Orlofsky, J. L. & Ginsburg, S. D. (1980). Intimacy status: Relationship to affect cognition. Adolescence, 16, 91-100.

Orlofsky, J. L., Marcia, J. E. & Lesser, I. M. (1973). Ego identity status and the intimacy versus isolation crisis of young adulthood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 27, 211-219.

Prager, K. J. (1983). Development of intimacy in young adults: A multi-dimensional view. Psychological Reports, 52, 751-756.

Prager, K. J. (in press). Intimacy status: Its relationship to locus of control, self-disclosure and anxiety in adults.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin.

Rubin, Z., Hill, C. T., Peplau, L. A., & Dunkel-Schetter, C. (1980). Self-disclosure in dating couples: sex roles and the ethic of openness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 305-317.

Shaffer, D. R., Smith, J. E. & Tomarelli, M. (1982). Self-monitoring as a determinant of self-disclosure reciprocity during the acquaintance process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, (1), 163-175.

Shapiro, A. & Swensen, C. H. (1977). Self-disclosure as a function of self-concept and sex. Journal of Personality Assessment, 41, 144-149.

Sherman, R. C. & Goodson, J. L. (1975). The intimacy of discussion topics: A comparison of three scaling methods. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 6, (6), 581-584.

Solano, C. H., Batten, P. G. & Parish, E. A. (1982). Loneliness and patterns of self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, (3), 524-531.

Tesch, S. A. (1984). Sex-role orientation and intimacy status in men and women. Sex Roles, 11, (5/6), 451-465.

Tesch, S. A. & Whitbourne, S. K. (1982). Intimacy and identity status in young adults. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 1041-1051.

Tolstedt, B. E. & Stokes, J. P. (1983). Relation of verbal, affective, and physical intimacy to marital satisfaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, (4), 573-580.

Tolstedt, B. E. & Stokes, J. P. (1984). Self-disclosure, intimacy, and the depenetration process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 84-90.

Waring, E. M. & Chelune, G. J. (1983). Marital intimacy and self-disclosure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 39, (2), 183-190.

Winum, P. C., Banikiotes, P. G. & Neimeyer, G. J. (1981, August). The appropriateness of situational disclosures and interpersonal perceptions. Paper presented at the Annual Convention, American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, California.